

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/733,935	BROKENSHIRE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laurel Lashley	2132	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Laurel Lashley. (3) Stephen J. Walder, Jr., Reg No. 41534.
 (2) Gilberto Barron, Jr., SPE AU 2132. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 October 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-25.


Identification of prior art discussed: US Patent No. 6311276, Connery et al.; US Patent No. 6832316, Sibert.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


GILBERTO BARRON JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative summarized the claimed invention and detailed the novel features of the invention. The Applicant's representative asserted and explained that the timestamp of Connery et al. could not be interpreted as a publicly known constant. The Examiner then explained the interpretation of the timestamp and how it reads on Applicant's claim. No agreement between the Applicant's representative and the Examiner was reached. The interview concluded with the Examiner understanding Applicant's position on the issues discussed in the rejection and remarks, and such arguments will be taken into consideration in future correspondences.